A Formal Framework for Access Rights Analysis

Xin Li^1 and Hua Vy Le Thanh²

¹ University of Tokyo,
 ² University of Science - Ho Chi Minh City

Abstract. A stack-based access control mechanism is to prevent untrusted codes from accessing protected resources in distributed application systems, such as Java-centric web applications and Microsoft .NET framework. Such an access control mechanism is enforced at runtime by stack inspection that inspects methods in the current call stack for granted permissions. Nowadays practiced approaches to generating policy files for an application are still manually done by developers based on domain-specific knowledges and testing, due to overwhelming technical challenges involved and engineering efforts in the automation.

This paper presents a formal framework of access rights analysis for Java applications, which includes both policy generation and checking. The analysis of policy generation automatically generates access control policies for the given program that necessarily ensure the program to pass stack inspection. The analysis of policy checking takes as input a policy file and determines whether access control in the concerned domain always succeed or may fail. The answer can either help detect redundant inspection points or refine the given policies. All of our analysis algorithms are novelly designed in the framework of conditional weighted pushdown systems, and are expected to achieve a high level of precision in the literature.

1 Introduction

In modern Web platforms, such as Java-centric web applications or Microsoft .NET framework, applications comprise components from different origins with diverse levels of trust. A *stack-based access control* mechanism is employed in an attempt to prevent untrusted codes from accessing protected resources. Access control policies are expressed in terms of *permissions* (e.g., a permission can be "writing the file C:/students_grades.txt") that are granted to codes grouped by different domains (e.g., www.jaist.ac.jp/faculty). Developers can set checkpoints through the Java API CheckPermission(Permission) in their programs, and access control is enforced dynamically at runtime by the well-known security mechanism *stack inspection*. When stack inspection is triggered, the current call stack will be inspected in a top-down manner on whether methods in the stack are granted the required permission until a *privileged* method is found. A caller can be marked as being *privileged*, and the stack inspection stops at such a caller. If all callers have the specified permission, access control is passed and stack inspection returns quietly, otherwise the program execution will be interrupted immediately.

Access control is often the first step to protect safety-critical systems. However, for practiced approaches, nowadays policy files are still generated manually by developers based on domain-specific knowledge, and measured by a trial-anderror testing as to whether the policy file allows the application to run properly. Since testing cannot cover all program runtime behaviors, the application could malfunction due to accidental authorization failures given a misconfigured policy. On the other hand, if a security policy is too conservative, i.e., some codes are granted permissions than necessary, it violates the PLP (Principle of Least Privilege), and the codes become vulnerable points for malicious attacks. Moreover, from a practical perspective, such runtime inspection may cause a considerable runtime overhead. If access control at some checkpoints always succeed at runtime, the runtime overhead can be reduced by removing them.

Example 1 (Semantics of Java Stack Inspection). Consider the code snippet in Fig. 1 that we borrow from [7] and modify to make checkpoints of stack inspections explicitly called.

There are two library classes Lib and Priv, and two application classes Faculty and Student. At the beginning of program execution, Java VM assigns all classes hereby methods in them to a set of permissions specified by a security policy. At runtime, the two client applications will require to connect to their corresponding domains by creating a socket (Line 35 and 41, respectively). Such a request will trigger stack inspection at Line 13 by the API checkPermission(Permission) from the class AccessController which takes a single parameter of type Permission or its subclasses. Student is required to posses the permission $perm_s =$ "SocketPermission(jaist.ac.jp/student:8080, connect)" and Faculty is required to hold the permissions $perm_f =$ "SocketPermission(jaist.ac.jp/faculty:8080, connect)".

Moreover, the socket construction process should be logged in C:/log.txt by the system for later observation. A file access permission $perm_a =$ "FilePermission (C:/log.txt, write)" is required on the system to perform this task, hereby another stack inspection is triggered at Line 29. Note that Student and Faculty reside on the current call stack but should not posses $perm_a$. To avoid authorization failures while logging, Lib invokes the API doPrivileged (Line 8) from the class AccessController with passing an instance op of Priv, and by Java semantics, op.run() will be executed with full permissions granted to its caller, and stack inspection stops at createSocket without requiring $perm_a$ from clients of Lib.

As shown in Example 1, access rights analysis is centered around reasoning permissions, which demands points-to analysis for identifying objects of Permission type, and string analysis for resolving string parameters of relevant security APIs. To the best of our knowledge, the only existing analysis that attempted to automatically identify authorization requirements and generate access control policies for Java applications is [7] from IBM, which is protected under the US patents. The analysis problem is challenging, because it is tough to design a precise and scalable algorithm for either string or points-to analysis. Moreover, it is not clear how to resemble these analysis results seamlessly in access rights analysis. We are aware of no investigations, and this paper is concerned with such a problem.

This paper presents a formal framework of access rights analysis for Java applications, which includes both policy generation and checking. Policy generation automatically generates access control policies for the given program that necessarily ensure it to pass stack inspection. Policy checking takes as input a policy file and determines whether access control in the concerned domain always succeed or may fail. The answer can either help detect redundant inspection points or refine the given policies. Our analysis algorithms are designed in the framework of conditional weighted pushdown systems (CWPDSs) [13] that is capable of reasoning properties over the stack.

Our analysis framework has the following features.

- We define an abstraction over calling contexts that glues different analysis modules, such as pre-assumed context-sensitive string and points-to analysis, seamlessly in the same analysis framework. We also provide solutions on how to lift exiting points-to analysis and string analysis to our needs. As opposed to modeling programs based on ordinary call graph, our analysis is based on context-sensitive call graph, taking into account dynamic features of Java languages. Note that privileged actions are also dynamically dispatched.
- Our analysis model combines call graph and dependency graph, which enables us to precisely infer permission requirements at checkpoints of stack inspection and to generate polices. The identification of permission requirements are often ignored or assumed to be known beforehand in existing work. The reason why call graph does not suffice is because Java objects of the Permission type can be created and referred to anywhere in the program, by either accessing the heap, i.e., field access, or by parameter passing of method calls that are finished before stack inspection. In either case, the data flow of permission objects is beyond the scope of the current call stack inspected by access control.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 recalls conditional weighed pushdown systems. Section 3 defines problem abstractions, and preassumed points-to and string analysis. Section 4 formalizes the problem of policy generation and checking, and Section 5 gives realization algorithms. Section 6 discusses related work, and we conclude in Section 7.

2 Preliminary

A pushdown system is a variant of pushdown automata without input alphabet.

Definition 1. A pushdown system \mathcal{P} is $(P, \Gamma, \Delta, p_0, \gamma_0)$, where P is a finite set of control locations, Γ is a finite stack alphabet, $\Delta \subseteq P \times \Gamma \times P \times \Gamma^*$ is a finite set of transitions, $p_0 \in P$ is the initial control location, and $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ is the initial stack content. A transition $(p, \gamma, q, \omega) \in \Delta$ is written as $\langle p, \gamma \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle q, \omega \rangle$. A configuration is a pair $\langle q, \omega \rangle$ with $q \in P$ and $\omega \in \Gamma^*$. A set of configurations C is **regular** if $\{\omega \mid \langle p, \omega \rangle \in C\}$ is regular. A relation \Rightarrow on configurations is defined, such that $\langle p, \gamma \omega' \rangle \Rightarrow \langle q, \omega \omega' \rangle$ for each $\omega' \in \Gamma^*$ if $\langle p, \gamma \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle q, \omega \rangle$, and the reflective and transitive closure of \Rightarrow is denoted by \Rightarrow^* .

A pushdown system can be normalized by a pushdown system for which $|\omega| \leq 2$ for each transition rule $\langle p, \gamma \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle q, \omega \rangle$ [19].

Definition 2. A bounded idempotent semiring S is $(D, \oplus, \otimes, \bar{0}, \bar{1})$, where $\bar{0}, \bar{1} \in D$, and

- 1. (D, \oplus) is a commutative monoid with $\overline{0}$ as its unit element, and \oplus is idempotent, i.e., $a \oplus a = a$ for all $a \in D$;
- 2. (D, \otimes) is a monoid with $\overline{1}$ as the unit element;
- 3. \otimes distributes over \oplus , i.e., for all $a, b, c \in D$, we have
- $a \otimes (b \oplus c) = (a \otimes b) \oplus (a \otimes c) \text{ and } (b \oplus c) \otimes a = (b \otimes a) \oplus (c \otimes a);$ 4. for all $a \in D, a \otimes \overline{0} = \overline{0} \otimes a = \overline{0};$
- 5. A partial ordering \sqsubseteq is defined on D such that $a \sqsubseteq b$ iff $a \oplus b = a$ for all $a, b \in D$, , and there are no infinite descending chains in D.

By Def. 2, we have that $\overline{0}$ is the greatest element. From the standpoint of abstract interpretation, PDSs model the (recursive) control flows of the program, weight elements encodes transfer functions, \otimes corresponds to the reverse of function composition, and \oplus joins data flows. A weighted pushdown system (WPDS) [18] is a generalized analysis framework for solving meet-over-all-path problems for which data domains comply with the bounded idempotent semiring.

Definition 3. A weighted pushdown system W is $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}, f)$, where $\mathcal{P} = (P, \Gamma, \Delta, p_0, \gamma_0)$ is a pushdown system, $\mathcal{S} = (D, \oplus, \otimes, \overline{0}, \overline{1})$ is a bounded idempotent semiring, and $f : \Delta \to D$ is a weight assignment function.

Let $\sigma = [r_0, ..., r_k]$ with $r_i \in \Delta$ for $0 \leq i \leq k$ be a sequence of pushdown transition rules. A value associated with σ is defined by $val(\sigma) = f(r_0) \otimes ... \otimes f(r_k)$. Given $c, c' \in P \times \Gamma^*$, we denote by path(c, c') the set of transition sequences that transform configurations from c into c'.

Definition 4. Given a WPDS $W = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{S}, f)$ where $\mathcal{P} = (P, \Gamma, \Delta, p_0, \omega_0)$, and regular sets of configurations $S, T \subseteq P \times \Gamma^*$, the **meet-over-all-path** problem computes $MOVP(S, T) = \bigoplus \{val(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in path(s, t), s \in S, t \in T\}.$

We refer MOVP(S, T) by MOVP(S, T, W) when there are more than one WPDS in the context. WDPSs are extended to *Conditional WPDSs* in [13], by further associating each transition with regular languages that specify conditions over the stack under which a transition can be applied.

Definition 5. A conditional pushdown system is $\mathcal{P}_c = (P, \Gamma, \Delta_c, \mathcal{C}, p_0, \gamma_0)$, where P is a finite set of control locations, Γ is a finite stack alphabet, \mathcal{C} is a finite set of regular languages over Γ , $\Delta_c \subseteq P \times \Gamma \times \mathcal{C} \times P \times \Gamma^*$ is a finite set of transitions, $p_0 \in P$ is the initial control location, and $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ is the initial stack content. A transition $(p, \gamma, L, q, \omega) \in \Delta_c$ is written as $\langle p, \gamma \rangle \stackrel{L}{\hookrightarrow} \langle q, \omega \rangle$. A computation relation \Rightarrow_c on configurations is defined such that $\langle p, \gamma \omega' \rangle \Rightarrow_c$ $\langle q, \omega \omega' \rangle$ for all $\omega' \in \Gamma^*$ if there exists a transition $r : \langle p, \gamma \rangle \stackrel{L}{\to} \langle q, \omega \rangle$ and $\omega' \in L$, written as $\langle p, \gamma \omega' \rangle \Rightarrow_c \langle q, \omega \omega' \rangle$. The reflective and transitive closure of \Rightarrow_c is denoted by \Rightarrow_c^* . We define cpre^{*}(C) = {c' | c' \Rightarrow_c^* c, c $\in C$ } and cpost^{*}(C) = {c' | c \Rightarrow_c^* c', c $\in C$ } for any $C \subseteq P \times \Gamma^*$.

Definition 6. A conditional weighted pushdown system W_c is $(\mathcal{P}_c, \mathcal{S}, f)$, where $\mathcal{P}_c = (P, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}, \Delta_c, p_0, \gamma_0)$ is a conditional pushdown system, $\mathcal{S} = (D, \oplus, \otimes, \overline{0}, \overline{1})$ is a bounded idempotent semiring, and $f : \Delta_c \to D$ is a weight assignment function.

We lift the model checking problem on WPDSs in Definition 4 to CWPDSs and refer it by MOVP as well.

3 Abstraction and Prerequisites

3.1 Abstraction of Java Programs

Definition 7 (Program Points). We denote by \mathcal{M} the set of all methods in a program, and by \mathcal{L} the set of program line numbers each of which contains a statement. Let $Tag = \{c, r, n\}$. A program point is characterized by its enclosing method $m \in \mathcal{M}$, line number $l \in \mathcal{L}$, and a tag $\in Tag$, and the set of program points is denoted by ProgPoint $\subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L} \times Tag$. Moreover, we denote by

- CallSite $\subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L} \times \{c\}$ the set of call sites, such that l contains a method invocation for any $(m, l, c) \in CallSite$; and
- $RetPoint \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L} \times \{r\}$ the set of return points of method invocations, such that $(m, l, r) \in RetPoint$ is the unique return point of a call site $(m, l, c) \in CallSite$; and
- Normal $\subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L} \times \{n\}$ for the remaining cases.

In sequel, we use χ to range over *CallSite* and ζ to range over *RetPoint*. Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of natural numbers. Given a finite set $S = \{s_0, \ldots, s_k\}$, ΠS is the set of permutations of s_0, \ldots, s_k . For a word $\omega = s_{i_0}s_{i_1} \ldots s_{i_j} \in S^*$ where $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $0 \leq i_j \leq k$, we define $\Sigma(\omega) = \{s_{i_0}, s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_j}\}$ to be the set of symbols that appear in ω .

Definition 8 (Call Graph). A call graph G = (N, E, s) is a directed graph, where $N \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is the set of nodes, $E \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times CallSite \times \mathcal{M}$ is the set of edges, $s \in N$ is the initial node with no incoming edges. We write $n \to n'$ if $(n, \chi, n') \in E$, and \to^* is the transitive and reflexive closure of \to . In particular, $n_{check} \in N$ and $n_{priv} \in N$ denote the method checkPermission and doPrivileged from the class AccessController, respectively. **Definition 9 (Calling Contexts).** Let $Context \subseteq RetPoint^*$ be program calling contexts in terms of call site strings. Given a call graph G = (N, E, s), the calling contexts of a method m is defined by $\phi : \mathcal{M} \to 2^{Context}$, such that

$$\phi(m) = \{\zeta_k \dots \zeta_1 \zeta_0 \in Context \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : m_0 = s, m_{k+1} = m, \\ (m_i, \chi_i, m_{i+1}) \in E, \chi_i = (m_i, l_i, c), \zeta_i = (m_i, l_i, r), \text{ for each } 0 \le i \le k\}$$

The calling contexts of a method, thereby local variables of this method, is the set of unbounded (reversed) sequences of method return points that can lead to m from the program entry.

Definition 10 (Abstract Calling Contexts). Let $AbsCtxt \subseteq 2^{RetPoint}$ be abstract program calling contexts as sets of call sites along each call sequence.

- An abstraction function α : Context \rightarrow AbsCtxt is defined by $\alpha(c) = \Sigma(c)$ for $c \in Context$, and $\tilde{\alpha} : 2^{Context} \rightarrow 2^{AbsCtxt}$ is defined by, for $c \subseteq Context$, $\tilde{\alpha}(c) = \{\Sigma(ctxt) \mid ctxt \in c, and cs' \notin \tilde{\alpha}(c) \text{ if } cs' \subset cs \text{ and } cs \in \tilde{\alpha}(c)\};$
- A concretization function γ : AbsCtxt $\rightarrow 2^{Context}$ is defined by $\gamma(C) = \bigcup_{C' \subseteq C} \prod C'$ for $C \in AbsCtxt$, and the powerset extension of γ is denoted by $\tilde{\gamma}: 2^{AbsCtxt} \rightarrow 2^{Context}$.

The abstract calling contexts of a method m is defined by a mapping ϕ_{method} : $\mathcal{M} \to 2^{AbsCtxt}$, such that $\phi_{method}(m) = \tilde{\alpha}(\phi(m))$.

AbsCtxt is an over approximation of Context. Let \triangleleft be a binary relation over Context such that $ctxt \triangleleft ctxt'$ for any $ctxt, ctxt' \in Context$ if $\Sigma(ctxt) \subseteq \Sigma(ctxt')$. It is not hard to see that \triangleleft is a preorder, and $\tilde{\alpha}(c) \subseteq cs$ iff $c \triangleleft \tilde{\gamma}(cs)$ for $c \in Context$ and $cs \in AbsCtxt$, hereby Theorem1.

Theorem 1. $(2^{Context}, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}, 2^{AbsCtxt})$ is a Galois connection.

Example 2. Given a call graph G = (N, E, s) where $N = \{m_1, \ldots, m_4\}$ and $E = \{(m_i, \chi_i, m_{i+1}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\} \cup \{(m_3, \chi_4, m_2), (m_2, \chi_5, m_4)\}$ with $\chi_i = (m_i, l_i, c)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $\chi_4 = (m_3, l_4, c)$ and $\chi_5 = (m_2, l_5, c)$. We have $\phi(m_4) = \{\zeta_3(\zeta_2\zeta_4)^*\zeta_2\zeta_1, \zeta_2\zeta_1\}$, and $\phi_{method}(m_4) = \{\{\zeta_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, 4\}, \{\zeta_1, \zeta_2\}\}$.

3.2 Pre-assumed Analysis

Our access rights analysis assumes the following context-sensitive points-to and string analysis, on which hereby the precision of our analysis depends.

Definition 11 (Context-Sensitive Points-to Analysis). Given a reference variable v of method m, a context-sensitive points-to analysis, denoted by pta(v), (i) returns the finite set of abstract heap objects that v may refer to at runtime under certain calling contexts; (ii) each object in pta(v) is represented as a triplet (type, loc, c), where type is its type, loc is its allocation site, and $c \in \phi_{method}(m)$ is the calling contexts under which the object is constructed, and (iii) we require that $\bigcup_{(type,loc,c)\in pta(v)} \{c\} = \phi_{method}(m)$ for any reference variable v of m.

Definition 12 (Context-Sensitive String Analysis). Given a string variable v of the method m, a context-sensitive string analysis, denoted by sa(v), (i) returns the finite set of string constants that v may contain at runtime under certain calling contexts; (ii) each element in sa(v) is represented as a pair (sv, c), where sv is the string value and $c \in \phi_{method}(m)$ is the calling contexts under which sv is constructed, and (iii) we require that $\bigcup_{(sv,c)\in sa(v)} \{c\} = \phi_{method}(m)$ for any string variable v of m.

The two dominating approaches to obtaining context-sensitivity of program analysis are known as *context-cloning* and *context-stacking*. Context-cloning resembles to inline expansion and as such has an inherent limit in handling recursive procedural calls. By context-stacking, we mean to model the program as a pushdown system and the analysis problem as model checking problems, e.g., in the framework of WPDSs in our setting. Since the stack of pushdown systems are unbounded, it naturally models recursive procedure calls.

It is relatively straightforward to adapt a stacking-based analysis to our setting, since WPDSs have the advantage of handling data flow queries as regular languages of pushdown configurations. For instance, consider the stacking-based points-to analysis Japot [12]. For each reference variable v of the method m, we can compute pta(v) by $\bigcup_{T_{ctxt}} \text{MOVP}(S, T_{ctxt})$ where S is the source configurations, and $T_{ctxt} = \{\langle v, m\omega \rangle \mid \Sigma(\omega) \subseteq ctxt\}$ for each $ctxt \in \phi_{method}(m)$.

To adapt cloning-based analysis to our needs, we can turn to the approach

in Def. 13 that is in line with context-cloning.

Definition 13 (Context-Cloning Driven by AbsCtxt). Given a call graph G = (N, E, s) (or graphs which product with call graph as the starting point of the analysis). We construct another graph $G_{clone} = (N_{clone}, E_{clone})$, where $N_{clone} \subseteq 2^{AbsCtxt} \times N$ is the set of nodes, $E_{clone} \subseteq N_{clone} \times CallSite \times N_{clone}$ is the set of edges, and we have (i) $(c, n) \in N_{clone}$ for $c \in \phi_{method}(n)$, and $n \in N$; and (ii) $((c, n), (c', n')) \in E_{clone}$ if $c \subseteq c'$ and $(n, n') \in E$ for $(c, n), (c', n') \in N_{clone}$.

One obtains context-sensitive analysis by applying context-insensitive analysis to G_{clone} , e.g., the points-to analysor Spark [11] can be lifted by cloning its points-to graph in this manner, and string analysor JSA (Java String Analyzer) [6] can be lifted to a context-sensitive counterpart by cloning its front-end flow graph, with no need to modify the back-end analysis engine.

3.3 Abstraction of Policy System

Definition 14 (Policy System). Let Domain denote the set of protection domains, and Perms denote the universe of all permissions involved in the given program. We denote by $\operatorname{dom}: \mathcal{M} \to \operatorname{Domain}$ the mapping from methods to their protection domains, and perm : Domain $\to 2^{\operatorname{Perms}}$ the mapping that grants permissions to protection domains. We define $\operatorname{policy} = \operatorname{perm} \circ \operatorname{dom}$. All classes, hereby all methods and all program points, in a protection domain are granted the same set of permissions. All methods belonging to the system domain, e.g., the method doPrivileged from the class AccessController, are granted all permissions in *Perms*.

Definition 15 (Check Points). We define CheckPoint as the set of call sites that directly call the method checkPermission, by CheckPoint = $\{\chi \mid \exists n \in N, \chi \in CallSite : (n, \chi, n_{check}) \in E\}$.

Let T_{perm} denote the class (or type) Permission or any of its subtype. Let $\phi_{perm} : Perms \rightarrow 2^{AbsCtxt}$ be a mapping from permissions to the calling contexts under which permissions are constructed. We generate *Perms* and ϕ_{perm} as follows. Initially, $Perms = \emptyset$, and $\phi_{perm} = \lambda x.\emptyset$. For each call site $\chi = (m, l, c) \in CheckPoint$ where l is supposed to contain the expression of "checkPermission(pv)". For each (Type, $loc, c) \in pta(pv)$, the heap allocation site referred to by *loc* contains expressions in one of the following form according to Java API specifications, where npv is reference variable of type T_{perm} , target and action are string variables, and Type $\in T_{perm}$.

```
{ npv = new Type(target,action) (1)
npv = new Type(target) (2)
npv = new Type() (3)
```

We add each permission perm to Perms, where perm =

$(\texttt{Type}, sv_1, sv_2)$	where $(sv_1, c_1) \in sa(\texttt{target}), (sv_2, c_2) \in sa(\texttt{action}), c_1 = c_2,$
	and $\phi_{perm}(perm) = \phi_{perm}(perm) \cup \{c_1\}$ for (1)
$({\tt Type}, sv)$	where $(sv, c') \in sa(\texttt{target})$
	and $\phi_{perm}(perm) = \phi_{perm}(perm) \cup \{c'\}$ for (2)
Туре	where $\phi_{perm}(perm) = \phi_{perm}(perm) \cup \phi_{method}(m')$ for (3)
	m' is the method that $locbelonasto$

4 **Problem Formalization**

Definition 16 (Context-Sensitive Call Graph). A context-sensitive call graph $G_{cs} = (G, \phi_{edge})$ consists of a call graph G = (N, E, s) and a mapping $\phi_{edge} : E \to 2^{AbsCtxt}$, such that for each node $n \in N$,

 $\begin{array}{l} - \ \phi_{edge}(e) \subseteq \phi_{method}(n) \ for \ each \ edge \ e = (n, \chi, n') \in E; \\ - \ \bigcup_{e=(n, \chi, n') \in E} \phi_{edge}(e) = \phi_{method}(n). \end{array}$

We define a mapping $\phi_{route} : (\rightarrow^*) \rightarrow 2^{AbsCtxt}$ by, for each $n \rightarrow^i n'$,

$$\phi_{route}(n \to^{i} n') = \begin{cases} \phi_{edge}(n \to n') & \text{if } i = 1\\ \{c \cup c' \mid \exists n'' \in N : c \in \phi_{route}(n \to^{i-1} n''), \\ c' \in \phi_{edge}(n'' \to n') \} & \text{if } i > 1 \end{cases}$$

In Java, due to dynamic dispatch, the target method of a dynamic dispatch (e.g., $r.fun(\cdots)$) depends on the runtime type of receiver objects (i.e., objects that r refers to). The calling contexts associated with a call edge and a call path is defined by ϕ_{edge} and ϕ_{route} in Def. 16, respectively. ϕ_{edge} can be generated by Java semantics of dynamic dispatch, given points-to analysis. An algorithm for constructing G_{cs} is given in [13]. We refer to [13] for details, and illustrate in Example 3 in appendix the semantics for "privileged" codes specific to access control.

Definition 17 (Valid Paths). Given a context-sensitive call graph $G_{cs} = (G, \phi_{edge})$ where G = (N, E, s), we define

- the set of (call) paths from s to a node $n \in N$ by

$$path(n) = \{e_0e_1 \dots e_k \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : n_0 = s, \ n_{k+1} = n, \\ e_i = (n_i, \chi_i, n_{i+1}) \in E \text{ for each } 0 \le i \le k\}$$

- the set of subsequences of path(n) that are truncated by the node n_{priv} as

 $tpath(n) = \{e_0e_1e_2\dots e_k \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : n_0 = s, \ n_{k+1} = n, n_0 \to^* n_{priv}, \\ e_0 = (n_{priv}, \chi_0, n_1), e_i = (n_i, \chi_i, n_{i+1}) \text{ for each } 1 \le i \le k\}$

- the set of valid paths from s to a node $n \in N$ by

$$vpath(n) = \{ \sigma \in path(n) \mid \exists c \in \phi_{route}(\sigma) : c \subseteq sites(\sigma) \}$$

where given a node $n \in N$, we define $sites(\sigma) = \{(n, l, r) \mid e = (n, \chi, n') \in \Sigma(\sigma) \text{ and } \chi = (n, l, c)\}$ for a path $\sigma = e_0e_1...e_k \in path(n)$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition 18 (Dependency Graph). Given a program in SSA (Static Single Assignment) form. Let $\mathcal{L}_{alloc} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ be the set of program lines that allocate objects of T_{perm} , and let $AllocPerm \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L}_{alloc}$. A dependency graph G_{dep} of the program is a directed graph ($N_{dep}, E_{dep}, S_{dep}$), where $N_{dep} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{L}$ is the set of nodes, $E_{dep} \subseteq N_{dep} \times N_{dep}$ is the set of edges, $S_{dep} = AllocPerm$ is the set of initial nodes with no incoming edges. Moreover, E_{dep} is the smallest set that contains (n, n') where n = (m, l) and n' = (m', l') if the variable (specifically, local variables like x, static fields like A.f, and instance fields like o.f where o denotes the abstract heap object resolved by points-to analysis) of type T_{perm} .

Definition 19 (Dependency Paths). Give a dependency graph $G_{dep} = (N_{dep}, E_{dep}, S_{dep})$, we define the set of dependency paths from S_{dep} to a node $n \in N_{dep}$ by $dpath(n) = \{e_0e_1 \dots e_k \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : n_0 \in S_{dep}, n_{k+1} = n, e_i = (n_i, n_{i+1}) \in E_{dep} \text{ for each } 0 \leq i \leq k\}.$

In the rest of this section, we fix a context-sensitive call graph $G_{cs} = (G, \phi_{edge})$ where G = (N, E, s), and a dependency graph $G_{dep} = (N_{dep}, E_{dep}, S_{dep})$. **Definition 20 (Relate Valid Paths, Dependency Paths and Permissions).** Given a node $n \in N_{dep}$, and a dependency path $\pi = e_0 e_1 \cdots e_k \in dpath(n)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $e_i = (n_i, n_{i+1})$ for each $0 \leq i \leq k$, and $n_j = (m_j, l_j)$ for each $0 \leq j \leq k+1$.

We define $\omega_r = \zeta_{i_0} \cdots \zeta_{i_j}$ where $0 \le i_0 \le i_1 \cdots \le i_j \le k+1$, $0 \le j \le k+1$, and for each $i_m \in \{i_0, \cdots, i_j\}$, $\zeta_{i_m} = (m_{i_m}, l_{i_m}, r)$ if l_{i_m} is a method call with return variable of type T_{perm} . Specifically, $\omega_r = \epsilon$ if such i_m does not exist.

The initial node of π is $n_0 = (m_0, l_0)$. Let $\sigma = e'_0 e'_1 \cdots e'_h \in vpath(m_0)$ be a valid path from s to m_0 in G for some $h \in \mathbb{N}$, where $e'_i = (n'_i, \chi_i, n'_{i+1})$ for each $0 \leq i \leq h$. We define $\omega_l = \chi_0 \cdots \chi_h$. Let [(m,l) denote $(m, l, c) \in CallSite$ and let $]_{(m,l)}$ denote $(m, l, c) \in RetPoint$. The set of all such parentheses induced by CallSite \cup RetPoint is denoted by Σ_{cfl} .

We say π matches with σ if $\omega_l \omega_r$ is a context-free language over Σ_{cfl} . The set of all such σ that π matches with is denoted by match(π). Given a permission perm \in Perms, we say π relates to perm, if (i) there exists $\sigma \in \text{match}(\pi)$, and (ii) there exists $c \in \phi_{perm}(perm)$ such that $c \subseteq \text{sites}(\sigma)$.

We define $nodes(\pi) = \{m_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq k+1\}$. Given a node $n' \in N$, and a valid path $\sigma = e'_0 e'_1 \cdots e'_h \in vpath(n')$ for some $h \in \mathbb{N}$ where $e_i = (m'_i, \chi_i, m'_{i+1})$ for each $0 \leq i \leq h$, we define $nodes(\sigma) = \{m'_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq h+1\}$ We say σ relates to π if there exists a path $\sigma' \in match(\pi)$ such that $nodes(\sigma) \subseteq nodes(\pi) \cup nodes(\sigma') \cup \{n_{check}\}$.

In Def. 20, π matches with σ means that π and σ jointly constitute a valid inter-procedural data flow with respect to permissions allocated at the initial node of π . By valid, we mean as usual that method calls and returns match with each other. If any calling context (i.e., the set of call sites) for allocating a permission is included (i.e., visited) in σ , we regard that π relates to that permission. We regard σ relates to π if the set of methods visited by σ is included in the valid inter-procedural data flow constituted by π and some $\sigma' \in match(\pi)$.

Definition 21 (Policy Generation). We define $policy : \mathcal{M} \to 2^{Perms}$ by, for each valid path $\sigma \in vpath(n_{check})$, and dependency path $\pi \in dpath(n)$ for each $n \in CheckPoint$, $perm \in policy(m)$ for each

- (i) $m \in nodes(\sigma)$, if σ relates to π and π relates to perm, and $n_{priv} \notin nodes(\sigma)$; or
- (ii) $m \in nodes(\sigma')$, if σ relates to π and π relates to perm, and $n_{priv} \in nodes(\sigma)$, and σ' is a suffix of σ for some $\sigma' \in tpath(n_{check})$.

Note that both π and σ in Def. 21 can be infinitely many.

Definition 22 (Policy Checking). Given a policy : $\mathcal{M} \to 2^{Perms}$ and a policy' : $\mathcal{M} \to 2^{Perms}$ generated by Def.21. Stack inspection triggered in the program always succeed if policy'(m) \subseteq policy(m) for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, and may fail otherwise.

We illustrate the idea of problem formalization by Example 4 in appendix.

5 Realization Algorithms

5.1 Policy Generation

Definition 23 (Modeling Context-Sensitive Call Graph). Given a contextsensitive call graph $G_{cs} = (G, \phi_{edge})$ where G = (N, E, s). We define a conditional pushdown system $\mathcal{P}_c = (\{\cdot\}, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}, \Delta_c, \{\cdot\}, s)$, where

- the set of control locations is a singleton $\{\cdot\}$;
- the stack alphabet $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{M} \cup RetPoint;$
- we write $\alpha \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} \omega$ for $(\cdot, \alpha, C, \cdot, \omega) \in \Delta_c$. Δ_c is constructed as follows, for each edge $e = (m, \chi, m') \in E$ where $\chi = (m, l, c)$, let $\zeta = (m, l, r)$, we have

$$m \stackrel{C_e}{\hookrightarrow} m'\zeta$$

where $C_e = \bigvee_{c = \{\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{|c|}\} \in \phi_{edge}(e)} \bigvee_{\{i_0, \dots, i_{|c|}\} \in \Xi(|c|)} \Gamma^* \gamma_{i_0} \Gamma^* \dots \gamma_{i_{|c|}} \Gamma^*$, and $\Xi(k)$ denote the set of all permutations of $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and \bigvee denote the set union of regular expressions.

In Def. 23, C_e means that some calling context of the call edge in question is contained in the current call stack.

Definition 24 (Modeling Dependency Graph). Give a dependency graph $G_{dep} = (N_{dep}, E_{dep}, S_{dep})$, we define a conditional pushdown system $\mathcal{P}'_c = (\{\cdot\}, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}', \Delta'_c)$, where Δ'_c is constructed as follows, for each edge $e = (n, n') \in E_{dep}$ where n = (m, l) and n' = (m', l'), we have

$$m \stackrel{C_e}{\hookrightarrow} \epsilon \text{ and } (m', l', r) \stackrel{C_e}{\hookrightarrow} m'$$

if l is a method return statement (or l' is a method call statement), where $C_e = \Gamma^*$, i.e., no conditions.

Definition 25 (Program Modeling). We define a conditional pushdown system $\mathcal{P}_{prog} = (\{\cdot\}, \Gamma, \mathcal{C}_{prog}, \Delta_{prog}, \{\cdot\}, s)$ where, $\mathcal{C}_{prog} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{C}'$, and $\Delta_{prog} = \Delta_c \cup \Delta'_c$, by combining \mathcal{P}_c and \mathcal{P}'_c generated for G_{cs} and G_{dep} , respectively.

Definition 26 (Weight Domain). We define a bounded idempotent semiring $S_{gen} = (D_{gen}, \oplus_{gen}, \overline{0}, \overline{1})$, where $D_{gen} \subseteq 2^{2^{\mathcal{M}} \times 2^{\mathcal{M}} \times 2^{\mathcal{R}etPoint}} \cup \{\overline{0}\}$, and $\overline{1} = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)\}$; and for any $d, d' \in D_m$, $d \oplus_{gen} d' = d \cup d'$, and

$$d \otimes_{gen} d' = \{ (M_1 \cup M'_1 \setminus M'_2, M_2, M_3 \cup M'_3, M_4 \cup M'_4) \mid (M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4) \in d, \\ (M'_1, M'_2, M'_3, M'_4) \in d' \}$$

One can prove that both \otimes_m and \oplus_m are associative, and \oplus_m is commutative and distributive over \otimes_m , which holds for a bounded idempontent semiring.

Definition 27 (Modeling Policy Generation). We define a conditional weighted pushdown system $\mathcal{W}_{gen} = (\mathcal{P}_{prog}, \mathcal{S}_{gen}, f_{gen})$. For each transition rule $\delta \in \Delta_{gen}$, $f_{gen}(\delta)$ is defined as follows,

- if δ is a push rule $m \stackrel{C_e}{\hookrightarrow} m'(m, l, r),$

$$\begin{cases} f_{gen}(\delta) = \{(\{m\}, \Gamma, \emptyset, \{(m, l, r)\})\}, & if \ m = n_{priv}, \\ f_{gen}(\delta) = \{(\{m\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{(m, l, r)\})\}, & otherwise \end{cases}$$

 $\begin{array}{l} - \ if \ \delta \ is \ a \ pop \ rule \ m \stackrel{C_e}{\hookrightarrow} \epsilon \ , \ f_{gen}(\delta) = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset, \{m\}, \emptyset)\}. \\ - \ otherwise \ f_{gen}(\delta) = \overline{1} \end{array}$

Definition 28 (Algorithm for Policy Generation). Given a conditional weighted pushdown system $W_{gen} = (\mathcal{P}_{prog}, \mathcal{S}_{gen}, f_{gen})$ constructed by Def. 27. We compute result = $MOVP(\{\langle \cdot, s \rangle\}, T, W_{prog})$ where $T = \{\langle \cdot, n_{check}\omega \rangle \mid \omega \in \Gamma^*\}$. For any $d = (M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4) \in result$, and perm $\in Perms$, we say perm is required by d if there exists $c \in \phi_{perm}(perm)$ such that $c \subseteq M_4$. For each $m \in M_1 \setminus M_3$, we have perm $\in policy(m)$ if perm is required by d.

For each d computed in Def. 28, M_4 is the calling history, in terms of method return points of valid inter-procedural data flows constituted by call paths and dependency paths; M_1 contains methods that reside on call paths truncated by n_{priv} ; M_2 is supposed to be \emptyset by our modeling, because n_{priv} can never be the initial node of call graph, and M_3 contains finished called methods that do not reside on the current call stack. We use Example 5 to show how the algorithm for policy generation in Def. 28 basically functions.

5.2 Policy Checking

Another popular need in access rights analysis is checking whether the program function properly, e.g., codes from trusted domains always pass access control, given a policy file that is commonly generated by the application developers. By Def. 22, one approach to policy checking is first generating a policy required by passing stack inspections by Def. 21, and then check whether the given policy includes the required policy. Instead of generating the required policy in advance, an alternative is on-demand checking whether all methods in the current call stack are granted required permissions at checkpoints. The two approaches to policy checking is quite in line with the two ways of implementing the stack inspection mechanism by virtual machines in an either *eager* or *lazy* manner.

We present an on-demand checking algorithm in this section. Given a trusted domain, our approach consists of three steps of (i) determining analysis points within codes of the given domain that trigger stack inspection; and (ii) identifying permission requirements involved in policy checking on each analysis point; and (iii) checking policy which determines whether stack inspections triggered by a concerned domain always succeed or may fail.

Definition 29 (Boundary). Given a call graph $G = (N, E, s, n_{check})$. Let $l : N \to Domain$ be a mapping from methods to their belonging protection domains. A boundary of a domain $dm \in Domain$, denoted by $\mathcal{B}(dm)$, is defined by $\mathcal{B}(dm) = \{n \in N \mid (n, \chi, n') \in E, l(n) = dm, l(n) \neq l(n)\}$

The boundary of a domain dm refers to methods with outgoing edges to methods from different domains, e.g., Java libraries.

Definition 30 (Analysis Points).

Assume the conditional pushdown system encoded by Def. 23. We define analysis points of a given domain $dm \in Domain$ by

$$\begin{aligned} AnalysisPoints(dm) &= \{ \zeta = (n, l, r) \in RetPoint \mid n \in \mathcal{B}(dm), l \in \mathcal{L}, \exists n' \in \Gamma, \\ \omega, \omega' \in \Gamma^* : \langle \cdot, n' \zeta \omega' \rangle \in cpost^*(\{ \langle \cdot, s \rangle \}) \cap cpre^*(\{ \langle \cdot, n_{check} \omega \rangle \}) \} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 31 (Modeling Permission Requirements). We define a conditional weighted pushdown system $W_{ctx} = (\mathcal{P}_{prog}, \mathcal{S}_{ctx}, f_{ctx})$ where \mathcal{P}_{prog} is the conditional pushdown system defined before, and

- the idempotent semiring $S_{ctx} = (D_{ctx}, \oplus_{ctx}, \otimes_{ctx}, \overline{0}, \overline{1})$, where $D = 2^{2^{\mathcal{M}}} \cup \{\overline{0}\}, \overline{1} = \emptyset, \oplus_{ctx}$ is set union, and \otimes_{ctx} is element-wise set union;
- for each $\delta : \alpha \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} \omega \in \Delta_{gen}$, $f_{ctx}(\delta) = \{\{n'\}\}$ if $\omega = n\zeta$, $\zeta = (n', l, r)$, and $f_{ctx}(r) = \overline{1}$ otherwise.

Definition 32 (Identifying Permission Requirements). Given a domain $dm \in Domain$ and an analysis point $\zeta = (n, l, r) \in AnalysisPoints(dm)$, we compute $\phi_{method}(n) = MOVP(S, T, W_{ctx})$ where $S = \{\langle \cdot, s \rangle\}$, $T = \{\langle \cdot, n\omega \mid \omega \in \Gamma^* \}$. We define permission requirements on n by

 $PermReqs(\zeta) = \{perm \in Perms \mid \exists c \in \phi_{method}(n), c' \in \phi_{perm}(perm) : c' \subseteq c\}$

We adopt the semiring $S_{check} = (D_{check}, \oplus_{check}, \overline{0}, \overline{1})$ in [14] given a a PER (Partial Equivalence Relation)-based abstraction with 2-point domain $\{ANY, ID\}$, where $D_{check} = \{\lambda x. ANY, \lambda x. ID, \overline{0}, \overline{1}\}$ with the ordering $\lambda x. ANY \subseteq \overline{1} \subseteq \lambda x. ID \subseteq \overline{0}$.

Definition 33 (Modeling Policy Checking). Given a context-sensitive call graph $G_{cs} = (G, \phi_{edge})$ where $G = (N, E, s, n_{check})$, we define a conditional weighted pushdown system $\mathcal{W}_{check} = (\mathcal{P}_{check}, \mathcal{S}_{check}, f_{check})$, where $\mathcal{P}_{check} =$ $\{\{\cdot\}, \Gamma_{check}, \mathcal{C}_{check}, \Delta_{check}, \{\cdot\}, s\}$ with $\Delta_{check} = \Delta_c \cup \Delta_{cp}$ and $\Gamma_{check} = \Gamma \cup$ $\{e_{cp}, x_{cp}\}$. Δ_c is defined in Def. 23, and Δ_{cp} is constructed as follows, for each perm \in Perms, we have

$$\begin{cases} \delta : e_{cp} \stackrel{L\&C}{\hookrightarrow} x_{cp} \in \Delta_{cp} \quad f_{check}(\delta) = \lambda x.ID\\ \delta : e_{cp} \stackrel{(!L)\&C}{\hookrightarrow} x_{cp} \in \Delta_{cp} \quad f_{check}(\delta) = \lambda x.ANY \end{cases}$$

where $L = (\alpha^*) + (\alpha^*)\beta\alpha(\Gamma_{check}^*)$ and !L is the complement of L, with

- $-\alpha = \{(n, l, r) \in \Gamma_{check} \mid perm \in policy(n), n \in N\},\$
- $-\beta = \alpha \cap \{(n,l,r) \in \Gamma_{check} \mid m = n_{priv}\}.$
- $-C = \Gamma_{check}^*(\zeta_0 + \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_k)\Gamma_{check}^*, \text{ where } \{\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k\} = \{\zeta \mid perm \in PermReqs(\zeta)\} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{N} .$

Definition 34 (Algorithm for Policy Checking). Given a domain $dm \in Domain$, and let $\{\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k\} = AnalysisPoints(dm)$. We compute

$$result = MOVP(S, T, W_{check})$$

where $S = \{\langle \cdot, s \rangle\}$ and $T = \{\langle \cdot, x_{cp}\omega \rangle \mid \omega = \Gamma^*_{check}(\zeta_0 + \zeta_1 + \cdots + \zeta_k)\Gamma^*_{check}\}$. We say access control for dm may fail if result = $\lambda x.ANY$ and always succeed if result = $\lambda x.ID$.

6 Related Work

From the theoretical aspect, Banerjee et al. in [1] gived a denotational semantics and hereby proved the equivalence of eager and lazy evaluation for stack inspection. They further proposed a static analysis of safety property, and also identified program transformations that help remove redundant runtime access control checks. The problem to decide whether a program satisfies a given policy properties via stack inspection, was proved intractable in general by Nitta et al. in [15]. They showed that there exists a solvable subclass of programs which precisely model programs containing checkPermission of Java 2 platform. Moreover, the study concluded the computational complexity of the problem for the subclass is linear time in the size of the given program.

Chang et al. [4] provided a backward static analysis to approximate redundant permission checks with must-fail stack inspection and success permission checks with must-pass stack inspection. This approach was later employed in a visualization tool of permission checks in Java [9]. But the tool didn't provide any means to relieve users from the burden of deciding access rights. In addition to a policy file, users were also required to explicitly specify which methods and permissions to check. Two control flow forward analysis, Denied Permission Analysis and Granted Permission Analysis, were defined by Bartoletti et al. [2] [3] to approximate the set of permissions denied or granted to a given Java bytecode at runtime. Outcome of the analysis were then used to eliminate redundant permission checks and relocate others to more proper places in the code.

Koved et al. in [10] proposed a context-sensitive, flow-sensitive, and contextsensitive (1-CFA) data flow analysis to automatically estimate the set of access rights required at each program point. In spite of notable experimental results, the study suffered from a practical matter, as it does not properly handle strings in the analysis. Being a module of privilege assertion in a popular tool – IBM Security Workbench Development for Java (SWORD4J) [8], the interprocedural analysis for privileged code placement [17] tackled three neat problems: identifying portions of codes that necessary to make privileged, detecting tainted variables in privileged codes, and exposing useless privileged blocks of codes, by utilizing the technique in [10].

In aforementioned works, they all assume permissions required at every check-Permission(perm) point. That is, they either ignored or employed limited computation of String parameters. Correspondingly, the access rights analysis become too conservative, e.g., many false alarms may be produced in policy checking. To the best of our knowledge, the modular permission analysis proposed in [7] is the most relevant to our work . On one hand, it was also concerned with automatically generating security polices for any given program, with particular attention on the principle of least privilege. On the other hand, they were the first to attempt to reflect the effects of string analysis in access rights analysis in terms of slicing. A modular analysis algorithm is proposed to achieve the practical scalability, and the authors developed a tool Automated Authorization Analysis (A3) to assess the precision of permission requirements for stack inspection. However, their algorithms are based on a context-insensitive call graph and the analysis results can be polluted by invalid call paths. Moreover, their slicing algorithms are also context-insensitive.

Although stack inspection is widely adopted as a simple and practical model in stack-based access control, it has a number of inherent flaws, e.g., an unauthorized code which is no longer in the call stack may be allowed to affect the execution of security-sensitive code. A worth highlighting alternate model is IBAC (Information-based Access Control) proposed by Pistoia et al. in [16] for programs with access control based on execution history.

7 Conclusions

We have presented a formal framework of access rights analysis for Java programs, and analysis algorithms of automatically generating security policies for an Java program and analysis of policy checking on whether stack inspection from the concerned domain always succeed or may fail, given a policy file. Our analysis integrates with both points-to analysis and string-analysis in a unified analysis framework. All analysis algorithms are novelly designed in the framework of conditional weighted pushdown systems, which is modeled after combining a context-sensitive call graph and dependency graph of the target program and precisely identifies permission requirements at checkpoints of stack inspection. We expect a good precision of our analysis, which means low false alarms in policy checking and high compliance with the principle of least privilege. An available tool that can automatically generating security policies for Java applications doesn't exist so far. It would be interesting to evaluate algorithms proposed in this paper, and to put the techniques into practice by settling the scalability issue.

References

- 1. A. Banerjee and D. A. Naumann. A simple semantics and static analysis for Java security. Technical report, Stevens Institute of Technology, 2001.
- M. Bartoletti and P. Degano. Static analysis for stack inspection. *Electronic Notes* in Theoretical Computer Science, 54:706–80, Aug. 2001.
- 3. M. Bartoletti and P. Degano. Stack inspection and secure program transformations. International Journal of Information, 2004.
- B. Chang. Static check analysis for Java stack inspection. ACM SIGPLAN Notices, 41(3):40, Mar. 2006.

- T.-H. Choi, O. Lee, H. Kim, and K.-G. Doh. A practical string analyzer by the widening approach. In *Proceedings of the 4th Asian conference on Programming Languages and Systems*, APLAS'06, pages 374–388, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer-Verlag.
- A. S. Christensen, A. Møller, and M. I. Schwartzbach. Precise analysis of string expressions. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on Static analysis*, SAS'03, pages 1–18, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer-Verlag.
- E. Geay, M. Pistoia, B. G. Ryder, and J. Dolby. Modular string-sensitive permission analysis with demand-driven precision. 2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering, pages 177–187, 2009.
- 8. T. Habeck, L. Koved, M. Pistoia, and Y. Heights. SWORD4J : Security WORkbench Development environment 4 Java. Technical report, IBM, 2008.
- Y. Kim. Visualization of permission checks in java using static analysis. Information Security Applications, pages 133–146, 2007.
- L. Koved, M. Pistoia, and A. Kershenbaum. Access rights analysis for Java. In Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming, systems, languages, and applications, volume 37, pages 359—-372. ACM, Nov. 2002.
- O. Lhoták and L. Hendren. Scaling java points-to analysis using spark. In Proceedings of the 12th international conference on Compiler construction, CC'03, pages 153–169, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer-Verlag.
- X. Li and M. Ogawa. Stacking-based context-sensitive points-to analysis for Java. Hardware and Software: Verification and Testing, pages 133–149, 2009.
- X. Li and M. Ogawa. Conditional weighted pushdown systems and applications. Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2010 workshop on Partial evaluation and program manipulation - PEPM '10, page 141, 2010.
- 14. X. Li, D. Shannon, I. Ghosh, M. Ogawa, S. P. Rajan, and S. Khurshid. Contextsensitive relevancy analysis for efficient symbolic execution. In *Proceedings of the* 6th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems, APLAS '08, pages 36–52, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- 15. N. Nitta and Y. Takata. An efficient security verification method for programs with stack inspection. *Computer and Communications Security*, pages 68–77, 2001.
- M. Pistoia, A. Banerjee, and D. Naumann. Beyond stack inspection: A unified access-control and information-flow security model. *Security and Privacy*, 2007, 2007.
- M. Pistoia, R. Flynn, and L. Koved. Interprocedural analysis for privileged code placement and tainted variable detection. *ECOOP 2005-Object-Oriented*, pages 362–386, 2005.
- T. Reps, S. Schwoon, S. Jha, and D. Melski. Weighted pushdown systems and their application to interprocedural dataflow analysis. *Science of Computer Pro*gramming, 58(1-2):206-263, Oct. 2005.
- 19. S. Schwoon. *Model-Checking Pushdown Systems*. PhD thesis, Technische Universitat Munchen, 2002.

A Examples



Fig. 3. An Example for Context-Sensitive Call Graph

Example 3. Consider the code snippet in Fig. 3 that consist in methods m_1 , m_2 , n_{priv}, n_{check} , OnePrivAction.run(), and AnotherPrivAction.run(), and m_1 and m_2 do not have paths reachable to each other. Methods are grouped by dotted circles. OnePrivAction and AnotherPrivAction are classes that implement the interface PrivilegedAction. The set of call edges are $\{e_1, \dots, e_6\}$, e.g., $e_1 = (m_1, (m_1, l_2, c), n_{priv})$. We do not explicitly show the call site inside n_{priv} , because the method act.run() is implicitly involved when the method doPrivilege(act) is called.

Since n_{check} and n_{priv} are static methods, $\phi_{edge}(e_i) = \emptyset$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$. Assume the calling contexts of n_{priv} i.e. $\phi_{method}(n_{priv}) = \{c_1, c_c\}$, such that $(m_1, l_2, r) \in c_1$ but $\notin c_2$ (i.e., $\in c_1 \setminus c_2$) and $(m_2, l_4, r) \in c_2$ but $\notin c_1$ (i.e., $c_2 \setminus c_1$). We then have that $\phi_{edge}(e_3) = \{c_1\}$ and $\phi_{edge}(e_4) = \{c_2\}$ by the semantics of calling n_{priv} . Let σ' be a path leading to m_1 , and consider a path $\sigma = \sigma' e_1 e_4 e_6$. By above assumptions on the example, $(m_2, l_4, r) \notin sites(\sigma')$. We have $sites(\sigma) = sites(\sigma') \cup \{(m_1, l_2, r), (Another PrivAction.run, l_6, r)\}$ and $\phi_{route}(\sigma) = \{c \cup c_2 \mid c \in \phi_{route}(\sigma')\}$. σ is not a valid path because there does not exist $c \in \phi_{route}(\sigma)$ such that $c \subseteq sites(\sigma)$.

Example 4. Consider the code fragments in Fig. 2, where in the dependency graph each node corresponds to a permission manipulation statement and connected by the dashed arrows. The underlying call graph is also shown of which each node is grouped by the dotted circles and connected by the solid arrows. The following permissions are involved in this example:

⁻ perm₁: SocketPermission("domain : 80", "connect") induced at "npv = new SocketPermission("domain : 80", "connect")";

- $perm_2$: FilePermission("public", "read") induced at " $npv = new \ FilePermission(arg_{m_1}, "read")$ ";
- $perm_3$: FilePermission("personal", "read") induced at " $npv = new \ FilePermission(arg_{m_1}, "read")$ ".

where $perm_1$ is created and referred to by methods in the current call stack when stack inspection is triggered, whereas $perm_2, perm_3$ are created/passed by methods that are finished calls and do not reside on the current call stack of stack inspection, and stored/referred by field access such that their data flows are beyond the control flow to the the checkpoints.

Consider a dependency path π : (4)(5)(6)(7)(9)(10)(12) and a valid path σ : (0)(1)(3). By Def. 20, $\omega_l = [(m_2, l_1)[(m_1, l_3), \text{ and } \omega_r =]_{(m_1, l_3)}]_{(m_2, l_1)}$. We have π relates to σ and further relates to $perm_2$ that is constructed following the path σ . Consider a valid path σ' : (0)(11)(13). By Def. ??, $nodes(\sigma') = \{s, m_2, m_3, n_{check}\}$, and $nodes(\pi) \cup nodes(\sigma) = \{s, m_3, m_2, m_1, m_0\}$. We have σ' relates to π and thus to $perm_2$. By Def. 21, s, m_2, m_3 will be granted $perm_2$, whereas m_0, m_1 should not. If we consider the dependency path π' : (14) and the valid path σ'' : (0)(15). We have $\omega_r = \epsilon$ and that π' relates to σ'' and hereby relates to $perm_1$, and s, m_2 should be granted $perm_1$.

Example 5. Consider Example 1. We denote methods connectToFaculty, ConnectToStudent, createSocket, checkConnect, checkAccess by m_f , m_s , m_{socket} , $m_{connect}$, m_{access} , respectively; and assume that m_f and m_s are called from the entry method s from l_1 and l_2 , respectively. Δ_c in Def. 23 is constructed as follows, and Δ'_c for dependency graphs in Def 24 is \emptyset .

$$\begin{cases} \delta_{1}: s \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{f} \zeta_{1}, \text{ where } \zeta_{1} = (s, l_{1}, r) \\ \delta_{2}: s \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{s} \zeta_{2}, \text{ where } \zeta_{2} = (s, l_{2}, r) \\ \delta_{3}: m_{f} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{socket} \zeta_{3}, \text{ where } \zeta_{3} = (m_{f}, l_{37}, r) \\ \delta_{4}: m_{s} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{socket} \zeta_{4}, \text{ where } \zeta_{4} = (m_{s}, l_{44}, r) \\ \delta_{5}: m_{socket} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{connect} \zeta_{5}, \text{ where } \zeta_{5} = (m_{socket}, l_{6}, r) \\ \delta_{6}: m_{connect} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} n_{check} \zeta_{6}, \text{ where } \zeta_{6} = (m_{connect}, l_{13}, r) \\ \delta_{7}: m_{socket} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} n_{priv} \zeta_{7}, \text{ where } \zeta_{7} = (m_{socket}, l_{8}, r) \\ \delta_{8}: n_{priv} \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} Priv.run \zeta_{8}, \text{ where } \zeta_{8} = (n_{priv}, l_{*}, r) \\ \delta_{9}: Priv.run \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_{access} \zeta_{9}, \text{ where } \zeta_{10} = (m_{access}, l_{30}, r) \end{cases}$$

where l_* denotes somewhere unknown, and (i) $f_{gen}(\delta_8) = \{(\{n_{priv}\}, \Gamma, \emptyset, \{\zeta_8\})\}$ and $f_{gen}(\delta_i) = \{(\{m\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i\})\}$ for $\delta_i : m \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m' \zeta_i$ with $i \neq 8$; (ii) $C = \Gamma^*$ and C_e is in the form of Def. 23 with $\phi_{edge}(e) = \{\{\zeta_1, \zeta_3, \zeta_5\}, \{\zeta_2, \zeta_4, \zeta_5\}\}.$ We compute $result = \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\}$ in Def. 28, where

$$\begin{cases} d_1 = (\{s, m_s, m_{socket}, m_{connect}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\}\}) \\ d_2 = (\{Priv.run, m_{access}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10\}\}) \\ d_3 = (\{Priv.run, m_{access}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10\}\}) \\ d_4 = (\{s, m_f, m_{socket}, m_{connect}\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{1, 3, 5, 6\}\}) \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{cases} \phi_{perm}(perm_a) = \{\{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{1, 3, 7, 8, 9\}\}, \{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{2, 4, 7, 8, 9\}\}\}\\ \phi_{perm}(perm_f) = \{\{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{1, 3, 5\}\}\}\\ \phi_{perm}(perm_s) = \{\{\zeta_i \mid i \in \{2, 4, 5\}\}\}\end{cases}$$

By Def. 28, we can conclude that $perm_a$ is required by $d_2, d_3, perm_f$ is required by d_4 , and $perm_s$ is required by d_1 , and $Priv.run, m_{access}$ possess $perm_a, m_f$ possess $perm_f, m_s$ posses $perm_s$, and $s, m_{socket}, m_{connect}$ possess $perm_s, perm_f$.

We use parts of Example 2 to briefly demonstrate the case when dependency graphs play a role. Consider the call path (0)(1)(3) and dependency path (4)(5)(6)(7)(9)(10)(12)(13). Δ_c is constructed as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \delta_1 : s \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_2 \zeta_1, \text{ where } \zeta_1 = (s, l_*, r) \\ \delta_2 : m_2 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_1 \zeta_2, \text{ where } \zeta_2 = (m_2, l_1, r) \\ \delta_3 : m_1 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_0 \zeta_3, \text{ where } \zeta_3 = (m_1, l_3, r) \\ \delta_4 : m_2 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_3 \zeta_4, \text{ where } \zeta_4 = (m_2, l_4, r) \\ \delta_5 : m_3 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} n_{check} \zeta_5, \text{ where } \zeta_5 = (m_3, l_6, r) \end{cases}$$

and Δ_c' is constructed as follows,

$$\begin{cases} \delta_6: m_0 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} \epsilon \ \delta_7: \zeta_3 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_1 \\ \delta_8: m_1 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} \epsilon \ \delta_9: \zeta_2 \stackrel{C}{\hookrightarrow} m_2 \end{cases}$$

where $f_{gen}(\delta_6) = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset, \{m_0\}, \emptyset)\}, f_{gen}(\delta_8) = \{(\emptyset, \emptyset, \{m_1\}, \emptyset)\}, \text{ and } f_{gen}(\delta_i) = \{(\{m\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, \{\zeta_i\})\} \text{ for } \delta_i : m \xrightarrow{C} m' \zeta_i \text{ with } i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \text{ and } C = \Gamma^*.$ We compute $result = \{(M_1, \emptyset, \{m_0, m_1\}, M_4)\}, \text{ where } M_1 = \{s, m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3, M_4\}, M_4\}$

We compute $result = \{(M_1, \emptyset, \{m_0, m_1\}, M_4)\}$, where $M_1 = \{s, m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3, n_{check}\}$ and $M_4 = \{\zeta_i \mid 1 \le i \le 5\}$. Since $\phi_{perm}(perm_2) = \{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3\}$. We know $perm_2$ is granted to methods in $M_1 \setminus \{m_0, m_1\}$.

```
public class Lib {
    private static final String dir = "C:";
    private static final String logFile="/log.txt";
    private static final String domain= "JAIST.AC.JP";
    public static void createSocket(final String host) throws
        Exception {
      checkConnect(host, 8080);
      Priv op = new Priv(dir, logFile);
      AccessController.doPrivileged(op);
      System.out.println("Enough permissions granted.");
    }
    public static void checkConnect(String host, int port)
11
        throws Exception {
    SocketPermission p = new SocketPermission (host+": "+port,"
12
        connect");
    AccessController.checkPermission(p);
    }
14
  }
15
  public class Priv implements PrivilegedExceptionAction {
16
    private final String dir;
17
    private final String name;
18
    Priv(final String dir, final String name) {
19
      \mathbf{this}. dir = dir;
20
      \mathbf{this}.name = name;
21
22
    }
    public Object run() throws Exception {
23
      String fn = dir + File.separator + name.substring(1);
24
      checkAccess(fn);
25
    }
26
    public static void checkAccess(String fn) throws Exception {
27
    FilePermission p = new FilePermission (fn, "write");
28
    AccessController.checkPermission(p);
29
30
31
  }
  public class Faculty {
32
    public void connectToFaculty() throws Exception {
33
      String host = Lib.domain.toLowerCase() + "/faculty";
34
      Socket s = Lib.createSocket(host);
35
36
    }
  }
37
  public class Student {
38
    public void connectToStudent() throws Exception {
39
      String host = Lib.domain.toLowerCase() + "/student";
40
      Socket s = Lib.createSocket(host);
41
42
    }
  }
```

Fig. 1. An Example for Java Stack Inspection



Fig. 2. An Example for Dependency Graph with Call Graph